REMARKS

The three-month period for responding to the last Office Action expired on July 28, 2005. A request for a two-month extension of time and the associated fee are enclosed. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. The inclusion of "new matter" has been scrupulously avoided. Claims 1-10 remain in this application.

The amendments to independent claim 1 are believed to place this application clearly in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a pneumatic front suspension assembly for an industrial vehicle, which includes:

> a pair of links mutually articulated about a pin substantially parallel to an axle, an upper link of the pair of links being articulated relative to a side member, a lower link of the pair of links being articulated relative to a rigid arm which itself is articulated relative to a side member, and "the pair of links absorbing transverse loads so as to substantially eliminate transverse movements of the axle during vertical motions of the axle without resort to or inclusion of a transverse link between a side member and the axle".

The present invention is thus noteworthy because it eliminates the need for a transverse link between a side member and an axle of a suspension assembly, and the disadvantages associated therewith.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Raidel (U.S. Patent 4,541,653) in view of McKenzie et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0008333). In support of this rejection, the Examiner refers primarily to the teachings of Raidel with McKenzie cited only for its teaching of an air spring adjusting the height of an axle relative to a side member.

This rejection, to the extent that it may be deemed applicable to the claims as now presented, is respectfully, but most strenuously traversed for the following reasons.

The suspension of Raidel uses and needs a cross radius rod (44) connected between axle (34) and chassis (32) in order to absorb transverse loads. All of the embodiments disclosed by Raidel contain such a cross radius rod.

Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to a skilled person to eliminate this cross radius rod of Raidel, as now explicitly required by amended independent claim 1, since there is no incentive to do so in Raidel, nor in the secondary documents cited by the Examiner. Indeed, the secondary documents do not deal with the problem of absorbing transverse loads and they disclose suspensions that are structurally different from Raidel.

Furthermore, if one considers the shapes and sizes of the torsion roll-bar 48 of Raidel, and particularly of the lower side legs thereof, it is obvious that its moments of inertia are inferior to the ones of the cross radius rod (44), and, *a fortiori* to those of the lower links (22, 23) together with branches (38,39) of the present invention. Indeed, the cross-section of the side legs in Raidel is circular and of small diameter (especially relative to the diameter of the cross radius rod 44), whereas the lower links of the pending invention are specifically configured to increase the movements of inertia along the three axes, hence to absorb transverse loads, in order to avoid the use of any "cross radius rod".

Accordingly, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion in the references applied against claim 1 to eliminate the cross radius rod of Raidel or to depend solely upon the Raidel torsion roll-bar (48) to absorb transverse loads so as to substantially eliminate transverse movements of the axle during vertical motion of the axle.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is believed to be clearly patentable.

In addition to the above-described unique use of the pair of links for absorbing transverse loads without a transverse link between a side member and the axle, the suspension of claim 1 also includes "a basically U-shaped additional element forming an anti-roll bar". The anti-roll

bar includes a transverse rod mounted between a bottom extremity of each lower link and branches located on either side of the transverse rod and linked to a respective lower link.

In Raidel, U-shaped torsion roll-bar 48 generally corresponds to the claimed anti-roll bar but it is not oriented in the same way nor is it connected to any separate lower links of a pair of mutually articulated links as required by independent claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claims 2-10 are allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they all ultimately depend, as well as for their additional limitations. The secondary references cited by the Examiner do not overcome the basic deficiencies of the primary reference.

If the Examiner continues to entertain any reservations about the allowability of the claims in this application, he is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the below indicated telephone number to resolve same.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Rothenberg
Reg. No. 26,429
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: 9/26/05

Heslin Rothenberg Farley & Mesiti P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203
Tel: 518-452-5600
Fax: 518-452-5579
E-mail: jr@hrfmlaw.com